F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	19.6%	54.2%	19.6%	5.2%	1.3%	153

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.8	18.2%	53.0%	21.2%	6.1%	1.5%	66
Female	4.0	22.2%	58.0%	14.8%	4.9%		81

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	19.1%	55.5%	16.4%	7.3%	1.8%	110
Students of Color	3.9	20.9%	51.2%	27.9%			43

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	18.4%	57.9%	13.2%	7.9%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	27.2%	45.7%	19.8%	6.2%	1.2%	81
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	3.1%	68.8%	28.1%			32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.7%	48.0%	20.3%	4.7%	1.4%	148

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.8	20.3%	51.6%	18.8%	7.8%	1.6%	64
Female	4.1	30.8%	47.4%	19.2%	2.6%		78

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	23.4%	46.7%	21.5%	6.5%	1.9%	107
Students of Color	4.1	31.7%	51.2%	17.1%			41

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.5%	50.0%	11.8%	8.8%	2.9%	34
Middle class	4.0	31.3%	42.5%	21.3%	3.8%	1.3%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.5%	59.4%	25.0%	3.1%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	<b>M</b> ean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	21.2%	49.0%	25.8%	2.6%	1.3%	151

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	15.6%	46.9%	28.1%	6.3%	3.1%	64
Female	4.0	25.9%	53.1%	21.0%			81

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.9%	48.2%	26.4%	2.7%	1.8%	110
Students of Color	3.9	22.0%	51.2%	24.4%	2.4%		41

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	26.3%	42.1%	23.7%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	22.8%	49.4%	25.3%	1.3%	1.3%	79
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.5%	53.1%	31.3%	3.1%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.7%	42.4%	32.4%	0.7%	0.7%	139

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	18.3%	38.3%	40.0%	1.7%	1.7%	60
Female	4.0	28.8%	46.6%	24.7%			73

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	22.0%	39.0%	37.0%	1.0%	1.0%	100
Students of Color	4.1	28.2%	51.3%	20.5%			39

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	22.9%	45.7%	25.7%	2.9%	2.9%	35
Middle class	3.9	25.7%	41.9%	32.4%			74
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	17.9%	39.3%	42.9%			28

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	13.9%	45.0%	38.4%	0.7%	2.0%	151

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.5	12.3%	35.4%	46.2%	1.5%	4.6%	65
Female	3.9	16.3%	53.8%	30.0%			80

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	11.0%	52.3%	33.0%	0.9%	2.8%	109
Students of Color	3.7	21.4%	26.2%	52.4%			42

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.6	16.2%	37.8%	40.5%	2.7%	2.7%	37
Middle class	3.7	13.8%	46.3%	37.5%		2.5%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	9.4%	50.0%	40.6%			32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 5

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	43.3%	47.3%	7.3%	1.3%	0.7%	150

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Weali	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	_		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.2	39.1%	50.0%	7.8%	1.6%	1.6%	64
Female	4.5	50.0%	46.3%	3.8%			80

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.3	43.5%	45.4%	8.3%	1.9%	0.9%	108
Students of Color	4.4	42.9%	52.4%	4.8%			42

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.4	43.2%	51.4%	2.7%	2.7%		37
Middle class	4.3	44.3%	45.6%	7.6%	1.3%	1.3%	79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.6%	46.9%	12.5%			32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 6

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls			4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	23.2%	41.3%	30.4%	3.6%	1.4%	138

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	17.2%	43.1%	32.8%	5.2%	1.7%	58
Female	3.9	28.9%	40.8%	27.6%	1.3%	1.3%	76

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	21.0%	39.0%	34.0%	4.0%	2.0%	100
Students of Color	4.0	28.9%	47.4%	21.1%	2.6%		38

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	33.3%	41.7%	16.7%	2.8%	5.6%	36
Middle class	3.8	21.4%	38.6%	37.1%	2.9%		70
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	13.3%	46.7%	33.3%	6.7%		30

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	34.0%	41.0%	22.2%	2.1%	0.7%	144

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.9	25.0%	45.0%	23.3%	5.0%	1.7%	60
Female	4.3	42.3%	41.0%	16.7%			78

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	27.6%	43.8%	24.8%	2.9%	1.0%	105
Students of Color	4.4	51.3%	33.3%	15.4%			39

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	37.1%	31.4%	25.7%	5.7%		35
Middle class	4.1	36.8%	40.8%	19.7%	1.3%	1.3%	76
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	22.6%	51.6%	25.8%			31

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 8

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.0%	47.2%	25.7%	2.1%	144

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.7	14.8%	41.0%	39.3%	4.9%	61
Female	4.2	33.8%	54.5%	11.7%		77

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.4%	46.6%	30.1%	2.9%	103
Students of Color	4.2	36.6%	48.8%	14.6%		41

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	33.3%	41.7%	19.4%	5.6%	36
Middle class	4.0	27.0%	45.9%	25.7%	1.4%	74
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.5%	53.1%	34.4%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 9

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	23.9%	35.9%	38.7%	0.7%	0.7%	142

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	23.0%	29.5%	44.3%	1.6%	1.6%	61
Female	4.0	26.7%	42.7%	30.7%			75

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	18.8%	34.7%	44.6%	1.0%	1.0%	101

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	27.0%	29.7%	40.5%		2.7%	37
Middle class	3.9	25.7%	36.5%	37.8%			74
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	13.8%	41.4%	41.4%	3.4%		29

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 10

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff				3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	21.0%	42.7%	34.3%	2.1%	143

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.7	17.5%	41.3%	36.5%	4.8%	63
Female	3.9	25.7%	43.2%	31.1%		74

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	18.4%	42.7%	35.9%	2.9%	103
Students of Color	4.0	27.5%	42.5%	30.0%		40

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	22.9%	42.9%	28.6%	5.7%	35
Middle class	3.8	22.7%	38.7%	38.7%		75
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	12.9%	51.6%	32.3%	3.2%	31

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 11

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin				3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	16.3%	46.9%	33.3%	3.4%	147

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin		5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.7	17.5%	44.4%	31.7%	6.3%	63
Female	3.8	15.4%	52.6%	30.8%	1.3%	78

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.9%	48.6%	30.8%	4.7%	107
Students of Color	3.8	17.5%	42.5%	40.0%		40

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.6	16.2%	37.8%	37.8%	8.1%	37
Middle class	3.9	18.4%	51.3%	28.9%	1.3%	76
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	12.5%	46.9%	37.5%	3.1%	32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 12

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	28.0%	34.7%	25.3%	10.7%	1.3%	150

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	21.9%	32.8%	29.7%	14.1%	1.6%	64
Female	3.9	33.8%	35.0%	21.3%	8.8%	1.3%	80

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	22.9%	35.8%	26.6%	12.8%	1.8%	109
Students of Color	4.1	41.5%	31.7%	22.0%	4.9%		41

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	_	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	27.0%	40.5%	21.6%	10.8%		37
Middle class	3.7	27.8%	30.4%	30.4%	10.1%	1.3%	79
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	28.1%	37.5%	18.8%	12.5%	3.1%	32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 13

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence	1: Very negative	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.4	5.1%	14.6%	55.5%	2.2%	2.9%	19.7%	137

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Gender								
Male	4.5	6.8%	11.9%	55.9%	1.7%	1.7%	22.0%	59
Female	4.2	4.1%	17.8%	56.2%	2.7%	2.7%	16.4%	73

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity								
White/Caucasian	4.5	5.0%	14.0%	53.0%	3.0%	3.0%	22.0%	100
Students of Color	4.0	5.4%	16.2%	62.2%		2.7%	13.5%	37

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background								
Poor/Working class	4.0	6.1%	24.2%	51.5%	3.0%	3.0%	12.1%	33
Middle class	4.6	2.7%	11.0%	58.9%		2.7%	24.7%	73
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	10.0%	13.3%	50.0%	6.7%	3.3%	16.7%	30

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 14

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	6.4%	18.2%	69.1%	2.7%	3.6%	110

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.3	8.7%	15.2%	71.7%	2.2%	2.2%	46
Female	3.2	4.9%	21.3%	67.2%	3.3%	3.3%	61

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.2	6.4%	17.9%	67.9%	3.8%	3.8%	78
Students of Color	3.3	6.3%	18.8%	71.9%		3.1%	32

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.3	6.9%	27.6%	58.6%	3.4%	3.4%	29
Middle class	3.1	3.6%	14.5%	78.2%		3.6%	55
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	12.0%	16.0%	60.0%	8.0%	4.0%	25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 15

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	30.9%	40.8%	22.4%	3.9%	2.0%	152

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.6	22.7%	31.8%	34.8%	6.1%	4.5%	66
Female	4.3	38.8%	50.0%	10.0%	1.3%		80

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	27.3%	42.7%	23.6%	3.6%	2.7%	110
Students of Color	4.1	40.5%	35.7%	19.0%	4.8%		42

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	26.3%	42.1%	21.1%	5.3%	5.3%	38
Middle class	4.0	34.6%	37.0%	24.7%	2.5%	1.2%	81
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	28.1%	50.0%	15.6%	6.3%		32

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	34.4%	35.8%	25.2%	2.0%	2.6%	151

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.6	23.1%	33.8%	32.3%	4.6%	6.2%	65
Female	4.3	43.8%	38.8%	17.5%			80

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	35.5%	31.8%	27.3%	2.7%	2.7%	110
Students of Color	4.0	31.7%	46.3%	19.5%		2.4%	41

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	42.1%	31.6%	18.4%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	4.0	37.5%	33.8%	25.0%		3.8%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.8%	46.9%	31.3%	3.1%		32

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	25.2%	40.4%	27.2%	3.3%	4.0%	151

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.5	15.4%	38.5%	33.8%	4.6%	7.7%	65
Female	4.1	33.8%	43.8%	20.0%	1.3%	1.3%	80

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	24.5%	40.0%	26.4%	4.5%	4.5%	110
Students of Color	3.9	26.8%	41.5%	29.3%		2.4%	41

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.6	23.7%	34.2%	28.9%	5.3%	7.9%	38
Middle class	3.9	32.5%	36.3%	25.0%	2.5%	3.8%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	9.4%	59.4%	28.1%	3.1%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 18

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.8%	42.4%	29.8%	0.7%	1.3%	151

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.6	16.9%	36.9%	41.5%	1.5%	3.1%	65
Female	4.2	33.8%	48.8%	17.5%			80

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	23.6%	46.4%	28.2%	0.9%	0.9%	110
Students of Color	3.9	31.7%	31.7%	34.1%		2.4%	41

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.9%	47.4%	21.1%		2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	27.5%	40.0%	31.3%		1.3%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.8%	40.6%	37.5%	3.1%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 19

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.1%	45.0%	22.5%	0.7%	0.7%	151

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.8	21.5%	44.6%	30.8%	1.5%	1.5%	65
Female	4.3	40.0%	47.5%	12.5%			80

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	28.2%	44.5%	26.4%		0.9%	110
Students of Color	4.2	39.0%	46.3%	12.2%	2.4%		41

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	34.2%	47.4%	15.8%		2.6%	38
Middle class	4.1	33.8%	41.3%	23.8%	1.3%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	21.9%	50.0%	28.1%			32

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	36.4%	43.7%	17.9%	1.3%	0.7%	151

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	_		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.9	29.2%	36.9%	29.2%	3.1%	1.5%	65
Female	4.4	43.8%	51.3%	5.0%			80

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	33.6%	43.6%	20.0%	1.8%	0.9%	110
Students of Color	4.3	43.9%	43.9%	12.2%			41

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	36.8%	47.4%	13.2%		2.6%	38
Middle class	4.1	37.5%	38.8%	22.5%	1.3%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	34.4%	50.0%	12.5%	3.1%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 21

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.8%	45.0%	19.9%	1.3%	151

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	26.2%	43.1%	29.2%	1.5%	65
Female	4.3	41.3%	48.8%	8.8%	1.3%	80

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	32.7%	42.7%	23.6%	0.9%	110
Students of Color	4.2	36.6%	51.2%	9.8%	2.4%	41

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	36.8%	44.7%	13.2%	5.3%	38
Middle class	4.1	36.3%	41.3%	22.5%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.0%	53.1%	21.9%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 22

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	35.1%	43.0%	21.2%	0.7%	151

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	24.6%	44.6%	29.2%	1.5%	65
Female	4.3	45.0%	43.8%	11.3%		80

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	31.8%	42.7%	24.5%	0.9%	110
Students of Color	4.3	43.9%	43.9%	12.2%		41

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	39.5%	44.7%	13.2%	2.6%	38
Middle class	4.2	38.8%	37.5%	23.8%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	21.9%	53.1%	25.0%		32

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 23

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	32.0%	40.0%	26.7%	1.3%	150

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	18.5%	44.6%	35.4%	1.5%	65
Female	4.2	43.8%	37.5%	17.5%	1.3%	80

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.4%	39.4%	29.4%	1.8%	109
Students of Color	4.2	39.0%	41.5%	19.5%		41

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.4%	43.2%	21.6%	2.7%	37
Middle class	4.0	33.8%	35.0%	30.0%	1.3%	80
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	28.1%	46.9%	25.0%		32

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.3%	42.7%	28.7%	0.7%	0.7%	150

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	12.3%	49.2%	36.9%		1.5%	65
Female	4.2	40.0%	38.8%	20.0%	1.3%		80

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	27.5%	43.1%	27.5%	0.9%	0.9%	109
Students of Color	4.0	26.8%	41.5%	31.7%			41

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	29.7%	43.2%	21.6%	2.7%	2.7%	37
Middle class	4.0	32.5%	38.8%	28.8%			80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%			32

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	21.5%	33.8%	40.0%	3.1%	1.5%	65
Female	4.2	42.5%	38.8%	17.5%	1.3%		80

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	32.1%	37.6%	28.4%	0.9%	0.9%	109
Students of Color	4.0	34.1%	31.7%	29.3%	4.9%		41

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	40.5%	37.8%	16.2%	2.7%	2.7%	37
Middle class	4.0	32.5%	35.0%	31.3%	1.3%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	34.4%	37.5%	3.1%		32

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	32.2%	46.3%	20.8%	0.7%	149

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	21.5%	44.6%	32.3%	1.5%	65
Female	4.3	41.8%	49.4%	8.9%		79

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	32.4%	46.3%	20.4%	0.9%	108

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	37.8%	51.4%	8.1%	2.7%	37
Middle class	4.1	35.0%	40.0%	25.0%		80
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	19.4%	54.8%	25.8%		31

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 27